REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 28, 2008. Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 to 46 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9 and 12 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 10, 13, 15 to 46, 63, 65 and 67 to 70 were objected to because of informalities. These claims have been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 15, 16, 19, 25, 31, 36, 37, 39 to 45, 63, 65, and 67 to 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for alleged failure to comply with the enablement requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, a folder search device is part of the hardware structure of the document system shown in Figure 2 of the present application, and those of ordinary skill would be able to make and use the claimed invention, including the claimed folder search device, based on the description thereof. It is true that the exact phrase "folder search device" might not appear in the Specification. However, it is believed equally true that those of ordinary skill would recognize that the general concept of a folder search device is supported by the Specification and the Drawings. Of course, if the Examiner can suggest more appropriate terminology, such suggestions would be welcomed.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46, 63, 65 and 67 to 70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,418,946 (Mori) in view of "Navigational utilities: finding your way through the maze" (Waltz). In response, the substance of dependent Claim 3 has been incorporated into each of the independent claims herein.

Accordingly, this should be viewed as a traversal of the rejection, as explained more fully below.

The present invention involves searching for a folder to store a new document based on similarities between the new document and other documents stored in a candidate folder. More specifically, the present invention involves retaining a plurality of folders, each having at least one document, in a folder retaining memory in a document storing system. The plurality of folders is searched to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing the new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders. The at least one identified candidate folder is displayed, and the new document is stored into a selected folder selected by a user among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

By virtue of the foregoing, a folder suitable for storing a new document can be selected by a user, since the user is provided with a display of a candidate folder or folders.

Applicants submit that the applied references, alone or in any permissible combination, are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 9 and 12, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of (i) searching a plurality of folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders, (ii) displaying the at least one identified candidate folder, and (iii)

storing the new document into a selected folder selected by a user among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

Mori is seen to disclose classifying stored documents according to a query. As shown in Fig. 2, stored documents 231, 233 and 234 are classified into document subsets 260 and 270 in accordance with the contents of a component represented by a classification attribute of a retrieval query. The classified subsets are displayed on corresponding virtual folders 280 and 290. Each virtual folder has a retrieval query and shows a document set satisfying a retrieval condition of the retrieval query as if the document set is in the virtual folder. By generating the virtual folder, classification of documents satisfying given conditions defined by a user is realized.

On the other hand, the present invention involves searching a plurality of folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among the plurality of folders. The candidate folder is identified by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders. The at least one identified candidate folder is displayed, and the new document is stored into a selected folder selected by a user among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

In contrast, Mori is seen to disclose classification of stored documents by displaying a document set satisfying a retrieval query in a virtual folder. However, Mori is believed to be silent on searching for a folder based on a similarity between a new document and other documents stored in a plurality of folders.

Moreover, Mori is silent on display of a candidate folder suitable for storing a new document. In the rejection of Claim 3, the PTO cited to Mori at column 7, line 31,

through column 9, line 24. However, the cited portion of Mori is not seen to disclose a display of a folder or folders that can be selected by a user for storing new documents. Rather, the cited portion of Mori describes display by which a user can enter query information. There is not a corresponding display of a folder or folders, after the query has been performed.

Therefore, Mori is not believed to disclose or suggest (i) searching a plurality of folders to identify at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document among the plurality of folders, by comparing a feature of the new document with an average of features of the documents stored in at least one candidate folder among the plurality of folders, (ii) displaying the at least one identified candidate folder, and (iii) storing the new document into a selected folder selected by a user among the at least one displayed candidate folder.

Waltz has been studied, but it is not seen to teach anything that, when combined with Mori, would overcome the deficiencies of Mori as described above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 9 and 12, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

No fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shant Tchakerian #61,825/
Shant H. Tchakerian
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 61,825

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2125482v1